

# PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM EFFECTIVE INSPECTION SPECIFIC INFORMATION

## Control Information

INSPECTION START DATE: 12/10/2013  
 INSPECTION END DATE: 12/10/2013  
 OPERATOR ID: 32210  
 OPERATOR NAME: DYNEGY KENDALL ENERGY, LLC  
 STATE/OTHER ID: Illinois  
 ACTIVITY RECORD ID NUMBER  
 COMPANY OFFICIAL: Todd Benninghoff  
 COMPANY OFFICIAL STREET: 601 Travis Street, Suite 1400  
 COMPANY OFFICIAL CITY: Houston  
 COMPANY OFFICIAL STATE: TX  
 COMPANY OFFICIAL ZIP: 77002  
 COMPANY\_OFFICIAL\_TITLE: Production Manager  
 PHONE NUMBER: (815) 955-1161  
 FAX NUMBER: (815) 521-1810  
 EMAIL ADDRESS: todd.benninghoff@dynegy.com  
 WEB SITE: dynegy.com  
 TOTAL MILEAGE: 2  
 TOTAL MILEAGE IN HCA: 0  
 NUMBER OF SERVICES (DISTR): 0  
 ALTERNATE MAOP (80% RULE): 0  
 NUMBER OF SPECIAL PERMITS: 0  
 INITIAL DATE OF PAP: 1/1/2007  
 TITLE OF CURRENT PAP: Public Awareness Program  
 CURRENT PAP VERSION: 1  
 CURRENT PAP DATE: 10/15/2011  
 DATE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL: 12/18/2013  
 DIRECTOR APPROVAL:  
 APPROVAL DATE:

OPERATORS COVERED UNDER PROGRAM: 

OPERATOR ID	NAME
32210	DYNEGY KENDALL ENERGY, LLC

UNITS COVERED UNDER PROGRAM:

PERSON INTERVIEWED	TITLE/ORGANIZATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Todd Benninghoff	Operations Manager	(815) 955-1161	todd.benninghoff@dynegy.com
Paul Lair	Relief Operator	(815) 521-1000	paul.lair@dynegy.com

ENTITY NAME	PART OF PLAN AND/OR EVALUATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Energy Maintenance Services	Plan development	(713) 963-7652	mvollmering@emsglobal.net
Paradigm	Mailings	(316) 928-4742	sarap@pdigm.com
Paradigm	Message content development	(316) 928-4742	sarap@pdigm.com
Paradigm	Pre-test materials	(316) 928-4742	sarap@pdigm.com

INSPECTOR REPRESENTATIVE(S)	PHMSA/STATE	REGION/STATE	EMAIL ADDRESS	LEAD
James Watts	State	IL	jwatts@icc.illinois.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Mileage Covered by Public Awareness Program (by Company and State)

Based on the most recently submitted annual report, list each company and subsidiary separately, broken down by state (using 2-letter designation). Also list any new lines in operation that are not included on the most recent annual report. If a company has intrastate and/or interstate mileage in several states, use one row per state. If there both gas and liquid lines, use the appropriate table for intrastate and/or interstate.

### Jurisdictional to Part 192 (Gas) Mileage (Intrastate)

COMPANY NAME	OPERATOR ID	PRODUCT TYPE	STATE	GATHERING	TRANSMISSION	DISTRIBUTION*	REMARKS (new?)
				INTRASTATE	INTRASTATE	INTRASTATE	
DYNEGY KENDALL ENERGY, LLC	32210	Natural Gas	IL	0	2	0	Turbine Power Generation Facility

1. Supply company name and Operator ID, if not the master operator from the first page (i.e., for subsidiary companies).
2. Use OPS-assigned Operator ID. Where not applicable, leave blank or enter N/A
3. Use only 2-letter state codes in column #3, e.g., TX for Texas.
4. Enter number of applicable miles in all other columns. (Only positive values. No need to enter 0 or n/a.)
5. \*Please do not include Service Line footage. This should only be MAINS.

Please provide a comment or explanation for inspection results for each question.

## 1. Administration and Development of Public Awareness Program

### 1.01 Written Public Education Program

Does the operator have a written continuing public education program or public awareness program (PAP) in accordance with the general program recommendations in the American Petroleum Institute's (API) Recommended Practice (RP) 1162 (incorporated by reference), by the required date, except for master meter or petroleum gas system operators?

- ☒ Verify the operator has a written public awareness program (PAP).
- ☒ Review any Clearinghouse deficiencies and verify the operator addressed previous Clearinghouse deficiencies, if any, addressed in the operator's PAP.

- Identify the location where the operator's PAP is administered and which company personnel is designated to administer and manage the written program.
- Verify the date the public awareness program was initially developed and published.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (h); § 195.440 (h)

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

The Operator utilizes Energy Maintenance Services ("EMS") for the plan implementation.

There were no clearinghouse issues identified by PHMSA.

The original plan was implemented in January of 2007 after Dynegy purchased and began operating the facility.

EMS is the administrator of the program and is located in Houston, Texas.

### 1.02 Management Support

Does the operator's program include a statement of management support (i.e., is there evidence of a commitment of participation, resources, and allocation of funding)?

- Verify the PAP includes a written statement of management support.
- Determine how management participates in the PAP.
- Verify that an individual is named and identified to administer the program with roles and responsibilities.
- Verify resources provided to implement public awareness are in the PAP. Determine how many employees involved with the PAP and what their roles are.
- Determine if the operator uses external support resources for any implementation or evaluation efforts.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (a); § 195.440 (a), API RP 1162 Section 2.5 and 7.1

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

Dynegy maintains a Management of Support Statement as required.

Resources were provided by EMS to implement and maintain the program. Information was provided to the stakeholders using a third party vendor - Paradigm.

Adequate buffers were utilized to identify the locations of stakeholders along the pipeline.

**1.03 Unique Attributes and Characteristics**

Does the operator's program clearly define the specific pipeline assets or systems covered in the program and assess the unique attributes and characteristics of the pipeline and facilities?

- Verify the PAP includes all of the operator's system types/assets covered by PAP (gas, liquid, HVL, storage fields, gathering lines etc).
- Identify where in the PAP the unique attributes and characteristics of the pipeline and facilities are included (i.e. gas, liquids, compressor stations, valves, breakout tanks, odorizers).

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (b); § 195.440 (b), API RP 1162 Section 2.7 and Section 4

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

The pipeline has no major or unique attributes on the transmission pipeline. The plan does cover the assets on the pipeline.

**1.04 Stakeholder Audience Identification**

Does the operator's program establish methods to identify the individual stakeholders in the four affected stakeholder audience groups: (1) affected public, (2) emergency officials, (3) local public officials, and (4) excavators, as well as affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents?

- Identify how the operator determines stakeholder notification areas and distance on either side of the pipeline.
- Determine the process and/or data source used to identify each stakeholder audience.
- Select a location along the operator's system and verify the operator has a documented list of stakeholders consistent with the requirements and references noted above.

[ ] Affected public

[ ] Emergency officials

[ ] Public officials

[ ] Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (d), (e), (f); § 195.440 (d), (e), (f), API RP 1162 Section 2.2 and Section 3

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

Stakeholders were identified using SIC codes, government databases.

For residents and businesses along the pipeline EMS utilized 660 feet either side of the pipeline as the buffer.

For Excavators 10 miles either side of the pipeline was used for a buffer or through records indicating they have notified EMS for excavation activities (review of JULIE tickets).

Emergency Responders were established using a buffer of 10 miles either side of the pipeline.

Public Officials were identified using a buffer of 10 miles either side of the pipeline.

### 1.05 Message Frequency and Message Delivery

Does the operator's program define the combination of messages, delivery methods, and delivery frequencies to comprehensively reach all affected stakeholder audiences in all areas in which the operator transports gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide?

- ☒ Identify where in the operator's PAP the combination of messages, delivery methods, and delivery frequencies are included for the following stakeholders: (1) affected public (2) emergency officials (3) local public officials, and (4) excavators.

☐ Affected public

☐ Emergency officials

☐ Public officials

☐ Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (f); § 195.440 (f), API RP 1162 Sections 3-5

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

#### COMMENTS:

Messages were delivered on the frequencies as required by RP 1162. Staff reviewed the postal reports for 2009-2012 to determine the intervals.

The frequencies utilizes are also defined on page 132 of the plan.

### 1.06 Written Evaluation Plan

Does the operator's program include a written evaluation process that specifies how the operator will periodically evaluate program implementation and effectiveness? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- ☒ Verify the operator has a written evaluation plan that specifies how the operator will conduct and evaluate self-assessments (annual audits) and effectiveness evaluations.
- ☒ Verify the operator's evaluation process specifies the correct frequency for annual audits (1 year) and effectiveness evaluations (no more than 4 years apart).
- ☒ Identify how the operator determined a statistical sample size and margin-of-error for stakeholder audiences surveys and feedback.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c),(i); § 195.440 (c),(i)

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

#### COMMENTS:

The plan requires an annual program implementation evaluation as defined on page 133-134.

The Program Effectiveness Evaluation is defined on page 134 and is to be performed once every 4 years.

## 2. Program Implementation

### 2.01 English and other Languages

Did the operator develop and deliver materials and messages in English and in other languages commonly understood by a significant number and concentration of non-English speaking populations in the operator's areas?

- ☒ Determine if the operator delivers material in languages other than English and if so, what languages.
- ☒ Identify the process the operator used to determine the need for additional languages for each stakeholder audience.
- ☒ Identify the source of information the operator used to determine the need for additional languages and the date the information was collected.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (g); § 195.440 (g), API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

The excavator and Affected Public brochures were sent out in both English and Spanish.

Page 1 of the plan states the program shall be conducted in English and in any other language commonly understood by a significant number and concentration of the non-English speaking population in the area.

## 2.02 Message Type and Content

Did the messages the operator delivered specifically include provisions to educate the public, emergency officials, local public officials, and excavators on the:

- ☒ Use of a one-call notification system prior to excavation and other damage prevention activities;
  - ☒ Possible hazards associated with unintended releases from a gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide pipeline facility;
  - ☒ Physical indications of a possible release;
  - ☒ Steps to be taken for public safety in the event of a gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide pipeline release; and
  - ☒ Procedures to report such an event (to the operator)?
- 
- ☒ Verify all required information was delivered to each of the primary stakeholder audiences.
  - ☒ Verify the phone number listed on message content is functional and clearly identifies the operator to the caller.

- ☐ Affected public
- ☐ Emergency officials
- ☐ Public officials
- ☐ Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (d), (f); § 195.440 (d), (f)

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

The messages delivered do include use of the one call and 811, possible hazards, physical indications of a possible release, steps to be taken for public safety, and how to report an emergency to the operator.

Staff reviewed the mailing lists and determined the required stakeholders were identified and sent mailings. The EMS profile provides as part of the mailing includes the emergency contact number and was called to verify it is an active number. The number 1-866-497-2284 is the EMS 24 Hour Call Center.

**2.03 Messages on Pipeline Facility Locations**

Did the operator develop and deliver messages to advise affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents of pipeline facility location?

- ☒ Verify that the operator developed and delivered messages advising municipalities, school districts, businesses, residents of pipeline facility locations.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (e)(f); § 195.440 (e)(f)

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

EMS utilized Paradigm to identify the stakeholders and delivered the required messages to these stakeholders. Staff reviewed the mailing lists and determined the required stakeholders were sent the required mailings in 2010-2012.

**2.04 Baseline Message Delivery Frequency**

Did the operator's delivery for materials and messages meet or exceed the baseline frequencies specified in API RP 1162, Table 2-1 through Table 2.3? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- ☒ Identify message delivery (using the operator's last five years of records) for the following stakeholder audiences:

- ☐ Affected public
- ☐ Emergency officials
- ☐ Public officials
- ☐ Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c)

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

The Baseline minimums for communication intervals and methods are defined on page 132 of the plan. These meet the requirements for transmission as defined in RP 1162.

Staff reviewed the mailing lists and postal documentation for stakeholders that were sent PA information.

## 2.05 Considerations for Supplemental Program Enhancements

Did the operator consider, along all of its pipeline systems, relevant factors to determine the need for supplemental program enhancements as described in API RP 1162 for each stakeholder audience?

- ☐ Affected public
- ☐ Emergency officials
- ☐ Public officials
- ☐ Excavators

Determine if the operator has considered and/or included other relevant factors for supplemental enhancements.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 6.2

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

### COMMENTS:

Enhancements and Supplemental Activities are defined on page 132-133.

The operator has not implemented supplemental activities.

## 2.06 Maintaining Liaison with Emergency Response Officials

Did the operator establish and maintain liaison with appropriate fire, police, and other public officials to: learn the responsibility and resources of each government organization that may respond, acquaint the officials with the operator's ability in responding to a pipeline emergency, identify the types of pipeline emergencies of which the operator notifies the officials, and plan how the operator and other officials can engage in mutual assistance to minimize hazards to life or property?

- ☐ Examine the documentation to determine how the operator maintains a relationship with appropriate emergency officials.
- ☒ Verify the operator has made its emergency response plan available, as appropriate and necessary, to emergency response officials.
- ☒ Identify the operator's expectations for emergency responders and identify whether the expectations are the same for all locations or does it vary depending on locations.
- ☒ Identify how the operator determined the affected emergency response organizations have adequate and proper resources to respond.
- ☒ Identify how the operator ensures that information was communicated to emergency responders that did not attend training/information sessions by the operator.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c), § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 4.4

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

### COMMENTS:

Defined in Emergency Plan that the operator will make contact with the local emergency responders annually. Page 117.

Staff reviewed the documentation and observed this was performed.

Expectations are the same for all emergency responders.

Dynegy includes the emergency responders in their annual emergency drill exercises at the Minooka plant.

## 3. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Annual Implementation Audits)



### 3.01 Measuring Program Implementation

Has the operator performed an audit or review of its program implementation annually since it was developed? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Verify the operator performed an annual audit or review of the PAP for each implementation year.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c), (i); § 195.440 (c), (i), API RP 1162 Section 8.3

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

#### COMMENTS:

Annual Audits are conducted by EMS and utilized by Dynegy to conduct the Public Awareness Program. Staff reviewed the documentation provided by EMS for the annual audits conducted on the plan.

### 3.02 Acceptable Methods for Program Implementation Audits

Did the operator use one or more of the three acceptable methods (i.e., internal assessment, 3rd-party contractor review, or regulatory inspections) to complete the annual audit or review of its program implementation? If not, did the operator provide valid justification for not using one of these methods?

- Determine how the operator conducts annual audits/reviews of its PAP.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.3

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

#### COMMENTS:

EMS utilizes internal audits, third party and regulatory audits. This is defined on page 134 of the plan.

### 3.03 Program Changes and Improvements

Did the operator make changes to improve the program and/or the implementation process based on the results and findings of the annual audit? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Determine if the operator assessed the results of its annual PAP audit/review then developed and implemented changes in its program, as a result.

- If not, determine if the operator documented the results of its assessment and provided justification as to why no changes were needed.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.3

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

#### COMMENTS:

No revisions have been made to the PAP due to the findings of the annual audits or effectiveness evaluations.

## 4. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Effectiveness Evaluations)

### 4.01 Evaluating Program Effectiveness

Did the operator perform an effectiveness evaluation of its program (or no more than 4 years following the effective date of program implementation) to assess its program effectiveness in all areas along all systems covered by its

program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Verify the operator conducted an effectiveness evaluation of its program (or no more than 4 years following the effective date of program implementation).
- Document when the effectiveness evaluation was completed.
- Determine what method was used to perform the effectiveness evaluation (in-house, by 3rd party contractor, participation in and use the results of an industry group or trade association).
- Identify how the operator determined the sample sizes for audiences in performing its effectiveness evaluation.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP1162 Section 8.4

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)  
☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)  
☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)  
☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

The effectiveness evaluation was performed in 2010 as required.

EMS utilized the data provided by Paradigm to determine effectiveness and are the messages being understood.

Sample size is 100 percent of the stakeholders that were sent information. Paradigm's review of the response cards determine how many responded and determined what they recalled from the information.

There have been no third party damages on the Dynegy pipeline system.

#### 4.02 Measure Program Outreach

In evaluating effectiveness, did the operator track actual program outreach for each stakeholder audience within all areas along all assets and systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Examine the process the operator used to track the number of individuals or entities reached within each intended stakeholder audience group.
- Determine the outreach method the operator used to perform the effectiveness evaluation (e.g., questionnaires, telephone surveys, etc).
- Determine how the operator determined the statistical sample size and margin-of-error for each of the four intended stakeholder audiences.

[ ] Affected public

[ ] Emergency officials

[ ] Public officials

[ ] Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)  
☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)  
☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)  
☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

Paradigm supplies EMS with the number of stakeholders sent messages and the number that responded using the questionnaire.

Questionnaires are utilized to measure outreach.

Paradigm sends the questionnaires to all stakeholders and then records the responses received from each stakeholder audience.

**4.03 Measure Percentage Stakeholders Reached**

Did the operator determine the percentage of the individual or entities actually reached within the target audience within all areas along all systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- ☒ Document how the operator determined the statistical sample size and margin-of-error for each of the four intended stakeholder audiences.
- ☒ Document how the operator estimated the percentage of individuals or entities actually reached within each intended stakeholder audience group.

- ☐ Affected public
- ☐ Emergency officials
- ☐ Public officials
- ☐ Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

Determination of sample size is 100% as each stakeholder receives a questionnaire with the information provided.

Paradigm then tracks the number of responses received by stakeholder and quantifies the percentage that responded.

**4.04 Measure Understandability of Message Content**

In evaluating effectiveness, did the operator assess the percentage of the intended stakeholder audiences that understood and retained the key information in the messages received, within all areas along all assets and systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual? (Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.2)

- ☒ Examine the operator's evaluation results and data to assess the percentage of the intended stakeholder audience that understood and retained the key information in each PAP message.
- ☒ Verify the operator assessed the percentage of the intended stakeholder audience that (1) understood and (2) retained the key information in each PAP message.
- ☒ Determine if the operator pre-tests materials.

- ☐ Affected public
- ☐ Emergency officials
- ☐ Public officials
- ☐ Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.2

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

In 2012 a BRC Phone survey was utilized by EMS to determine effectiveness. EMS reviewed the responses and determined no further actions were required.

Paradigm utilizes focus groups to test the materials that were by EMS through Paradigm.

**4.05 Measure Desired Stakeholder Behavior**

In evaluating its public awareness program effectiveness, did the operator attempt to determine whether appropriate preventive behaviors have been understood and are taking place when needed, and whether appropriate response and mitigative behaviors would occur and/or have occurred? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Examine the operator's evaluation results and data to determine if the stakeholders have demonstrated the intended learned behaviors.
- Verify the operator determined whether appropriate prevention behaviors have been understood by the stakeholder audiences and if those behaviors are taking place or will take place when needed.

[ ] Affected public

[ ] Emergency officials

[ ] Public officials

[ ] Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.3

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

Staff reviewed the results of the EMS and Paradigm surveys and determined the messages were being understood.

**4.06 Measure Bottom-Line Results**

In evaluating its public awareness program effectiveness, did the operator attempt to measure bottom-line results of its program by tracking third-party incidents and consequences including: (1) near misses, (2) excavation damages resulting in pipeline failures, (3) excavation damages that do not result in pipeline failures? Did the operator consider other bottom-line measures, such as the affected public's perception of the safety of the operator's pipelines? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Examine the operator's process for measuring bottom-line results of its program.
- Verify the operator measured bottom-line results by tracking third-party incidents and consequences.
- Determine if the operator considered and attempted to measure other bottom-line measures, such as the affected public's perception of the safety of the operator's pipelines. If not, determine if the operator has provided justification in its program or procedural manual for not doing so.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.4

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
- ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

**COMMENTS:**

There have been no third party damages or near misses on the Dynegey System.

EMS performed the annual audits and determined they were meeting the requirements, no damages have occurred and the messages are reaching the intended audiences.

The perception of the safety provided by Dynegey appeared to be good per the results of the stakeholders surveys.

#### 4.07 Program Changes

Did the operator identify and document needed changes and/or modifications to its public awareness program(s) based on the results and findings of its program effectiveness evaluation? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Examine the operator's program effectiveness evaluation findings.
- Identify if the operator has a plan or procedure that outlines what changes were made.
- Verify the operator identified and/or implemented improvements based on assessments and findings.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c), § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 2.7 Step 12 and 8.5

- ☒ S - Satisfactory (explain)
  - ☐ U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
  - ☐ N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
  - ☐ N/C - Not Checked (explain)

#### COMMENTS:

No modifications have been made to the program due to the findings of the annual audits, effectiveness surveys and regulatory audits.

### 5. Inspection

#### SUMMARY:

Review of the plan and associated documentation identified no issues were observed with the Public Awareness program utilized by Dynegy and implemented and maintained by EMS.

#### FINDINGS: